

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>MOSES MCCORMICK, et al.,</b>	:	
	:	<b>Case No. 2:19-cv-03329</b>
<b>Plaintiffs,</b>	:	
	:	<b>JUDGE ALGENON L. MARBLEY</b>
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	<b>Magistrate Judge Jolson</b>
<b>FRANKLIN COUNTY COURT OF COMMON</b>	:	
<b>PLEAS, DOMESTIC DIVISION, et al.,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants.</b>	:	

**ORDER**


This matter is before the Court on Defendant Jeffrey Anderson’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. Doc. 180. Defendant Anderson does not raise any arguments in his Motion; rather, he seeks to incorporate any argument raised by other Defendants in this case that might apply to him:

This Defendant does not see any benefit to the Court if he should repeat by the discussion of law and fact in the various motions to dismiss or for judgment on the pleadings and this defendant respectfully asks the Court to incorporate those arguments made by all other co-defendants into this pleading as if set out in full.

Doc. 180. It is not the Court’s role, however, to determine which arguments Defendant seeks to raise. *See McPherson v. Kelsey*, 125 F.3d 989, 995-96 (6th Cir. 1997) (“[I]ssues adverted to in a perfunctory manner, unaccompanied by some effort at developed argumentation, are deemed waived. It is not sufficient for a party to mention a possible argument in the most skeletal way, leaving the court to . . . put flesh on its bones.”). The allegations against Defendant Anderson are specific to him, and thus, the arguments raised by other Defendants do not necessarily apply with equal force. Moreover, by not specifying which arguments he seeks to raise in his Motion,

Defendant leaves Plaintiffs to guess. For these reasons, Defendant Anderson's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings [#180] is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

**ALGENON L. MARBLEY**  
**CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**DATED: May 4, 2020**